

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MARIANO MEZA,

Petitioner,

v.

WARDEN,

Respondent.

No. 1:23-cv-01736-KES-EPG (HC)

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND  
RECOMMENDATIONS, GRANTING  
RESPONDENT'S MOTION TO DISMISS,  
DISMISSING PETITION FOR WRIT OF  
HABEAS CORPUS, DIRECTING CLERK OF  
COURT TO CLOSE CASE, AND  
DECLINING TO ISSUE A CERTIFICATE OF  
APPEALABILITY

(Docs. 11, 13)

Petitioner Mariano Meza is a federal prisoner proceeding pro se with a petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241. This matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

On August 14, 2024, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations that recommended dismissing the petition as moot. Doc. 13. The findings and recommendations were served on the parties and contained notice that any objections were to be filed within thirty (30) days of the date of service of the findings and recommendations. *Id.* To date, no objections have been filed, and the time for doing so has passed.

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), the Court has conducted a de novo review of the case. Having carefully reviewed the file, the Court holds the findings and

1 recommendations to be supported by the record and proper analysis. As the magistrate judge  
2 pointed out, there is no Article III case or controversy because the petitioner has not suffered an  
3 actual injury. Doc. 13 at 2. The record in this case shows that petitioner has received the remedy  
4 he sought. *See* Doc. 11-1 at 3, 6. Therefore, he does not have an actual injury. *See Spencer v.*  
5 *Kemna*, 523 U.S. 1, 7 (1998) (explaining that the case or controversy requirement of Article III  
6 requires that petitioner must have suffered “an actual injury traceable to the defendant and likely  
7 to be redressed by a favorable judicial decision”).

8 Having found that petitioner is not entitled to habeas relief, the Court now turns to  
9 whether a certificate of appealability should issue. A petitioner seeking a writ of habeas corpus  
10 has no absolute entitlement to appeal a district court’s denial of his petition, and an appeal is  
11 allowed only in certain circumstances. *Miller-El v. Cockrell*, 537 U.S. 322, 335-336 (2003). If a  
12 court denies a habeas petition on the merits, the court may issue a certificate of appealability only “if  
13 jurists of reason could disagree with the district court’s resolution of [the petitioner’s] constitutional  
14 claims or that jurists could conclude the issues presented are adequate to deserve encouragement to  
15 proceed further.” *Miller-El*, 537 U.S. at 327; *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000). While  
16 the petitioner is not required to prove the merits of his case, he must demonstrate “something more  
17 than the absence of frivolity or the existence of mere good faith on his . . . part.” *Miller-El*, 537 U.S.  
18 at 338.

19 In the present case, the Court finds that reasonable jurists would not find the Court’s  
20 determination that the petition should be denied debatable, wrong, or deserving of encouragement to  
21 proceed further. Petitioner has not made the required substantial showing of the denial of a  
22 constitutional right. Therefore, the Court declines to issue a certificate of appealability.

23 Accordingly:

- 24 1. The findings and recommendations issued on August 14, 2024, Doc. 13, are  
25 ADOPTED in full;
- 26 2. Respondent’s motion to dismiss, Doc. 11, is GRANTED;
- 27 3. The petition for writ of habeas corpus is DISMISSED;
- 28 4. The Clerk of Court is directed to close the case; and

1           5. The Court declines to issue a certificate of appealability.  
2  
3

4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5           Dated: October 23, 2024  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE